IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH

AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO. 10518 OF 2006

DATED: 31-05-2006

BETWEEN:

M. Suseela

.....Petitioner

AND

The Government of Andhra Pradesh,

Rep. by its Secretary, Panchayat Raj

Department, Hyderabad and another

.....Respondents

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L. NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO. 10518 OF 2006

ORDER:

The petitioner was elected as Sarpanch of Mallayapalem of Gudivada Mandal, Krishna District in the previous elections. She was issued with a show cause notice dated 15-09-2005 alleging that she had forged the signature of the second signatory i.e. the Member of the 10th ward for drawing a sum of Rs.11,000/-. The petitioner submitted her explanation stating that after signing upon the cheque, she has sent it for signature of the Ward Member and she is not aware as to who has signed upon the cheque and she cannot be made liable for the same. The 2nd respondent passed order dated 19-04-2006 suspending the petitioner for a period of three months on the said allegation. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed a revision before the 1st respondent together with an application for stay. Her grievance is that the 1st respondent has not passed any order so far in the application for stay and the suspension ordered against her would adversely affect her, particularly in the ensuing elections.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government

Pleader for Panchayat Raj.

The petitioner had availed the remedy of revision before the 1st respondent aggrieved by the order dated 19-04-2006 passed by the 2nd respondent. Having regard to the fact that the allegation as to forgery related to the year 2003, the show cause notice was issued way back on 15-09-2005 and that the impugned order was passed almost at the verge of elections, this Court is of the opinion that the order of suspension needs to be stayed till the disposal of the revision by the Government.

Hence the writ petition is disposed of directing that the order dated 19-04-2006 passed by the 2nd respondent against the petitioner shall remain stayed till the 1st respondent disposes of the revision filed by the petitioner.

_____

L. NARASINHA REDDY, J

31-05-2006

ks

Note: Operative portion by wire at

Party's costs.

B/O

ks